DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 902 CS 214 141

AUTHOR Kamler, Barbara
TITLE The Construction and Reconstruction of Gender in Classroom Discourse: Disciplining the Student Body.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (83rd, Pittsburgh, PA, November 17-22, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Behavior; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Discourse Analysis; Elementary School Students; Foreign Countries; Primary Education; Self Control; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Songs; *Student Behavior; *Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Australia (Victoria); *Discourse Communities

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed the multiple purposes of songs in which children in early childhood classrooms sing and move their bodies to the lyrics, the discourses the songs mobilize, and the gendered positions the songs accomplish. Subjects, 28 students entering their first year in a suburban primary school in a large regional center in southern Victoria, Australia, were observed during their classroom and playground experience as part of a larger study. Close analysis of teacher talk, games, and song that took place during one morning was performed. Results indicated: (1) the purpose of the songs was "collective regulation," a gathering of attention, and an invitation to discontinue private conversation; (2) the songs regulated by targeting the children's bodies; (3) the songs were most often preceded and followed by teacher talk which regulated the body and provided guidelines to students on how to produce the right body; (4) bodily practices such as sitting became tied to pupil selection in gendered ways; (5) the children's game "Hands on Heads" was also transformed into a technology of regulation; and (6) while the teacher's discourse was remarkably free of gender positioning, she often acted unwittingly and against her own stated intentions. Findings suggest that the discourses of power which perpetuate gendered practice are not just to be found in language exchanges, but in practices enacted on and through bodies. (Four tables of data are included; 26 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 364 902

The construction and reconstruction of gender in classroom discourse: Disciplining the student body

Dr. Barbara Kamler
Deakin University
Faculty of Education
Geelong, Victoria 3217
Australia

Paper Presented to 83rd Annual Convention
National Council of Teachers of English
November 19-22, 1993
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The project reported in this paper was made possible by a Department of Education, Employment and Training Gender Equity Curriculum Reform Project Grant.

CS214141

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Kamler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Early childhood classrooms are filled with song. Songs such as the *The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow,* where children are encouraged to sing and move their bodies to the lyrics, are common fare in Mrs. T's Prep classroom.

Text 5.1. The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow

When all the cows were sleeping and the sun had gone to bed
Up jumped the scarecrow and this is what he said
'I'm a dingle dangle scarecrow with a flippy floppy hat,
I can shake my hands like this and shake my feet like that'.

When all the hens were roosting and the moon behind the cloud
Up jumped the scarecrow and shouted very loud
'I'm a dingle dangle scarecrow with a flippy floppy hat,
I can shake my hands like this and shake my feet like that'.

While it is usual to view such classroom songs as innocent fun, this paper aims to disrupt the usual and make the commonplace strange. It analyses the multiple purposes such songs serve, the discourses they mobilise and the gendered positionings they accomplish. I argue that *The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow* is not simply a form of entertainment to keep children amused, but works, in conjunction with other texts in Mrs. T's Prep classroom, to regulate children's bodies into the schoolgirls and schoolboys they become. For after all, the 'dingle dangle scarecrow' is the only figure in the song with agency and he is identified as male. His female defined counterparts, by contrast, are inactive; the cows are sleeping and the hens are exercising their biological imperative of roosting, but it is the scarecrow the children are asked to identify with. They become the scarecrow, they shake their hands and feet as he would and give voice to his words through the personal pronoun *I, I'm a dingle dangle scarecrow*. This suggests, perhaps, that a song of childhood is not necessarily a song of innocence.

The song and other data I present today come from a Gender Equity Curriculum Reform Project funded by DEET which we call the Construction of the Primary Schoolgirl. The we of my paper includes my colleagues Joanne Reid, Rod Maclean and Alyson Simpson with whom I work collaboratively on the project at Deakin University. The focus in this paper is the regulation of the child body through regulatory practices associated with teacher discourse and action, one of a number of issues we explore in this project (see also Kamler,B., Maclean, R., Reid, J. and Simpson, A.1994).

I will first provide a brief outline of the social and theoretical context for the study, locate my own discursive history as researcher, and then examine selected instances of songs, teacher talk and games which demonstrate some of the surprisingly concrete ways in which Foucault's (1977) notion of the institutionally regulated docile body are inscribed in the discourses of the first month of school. My analysis reveals that discourses of power which perpetuate gendered practice are not just to be found in language exchanges, but in practices enacted on and through bodies. This paper therefore foregrounds the centrality of the body to the process

of gendering and engages the problems involved in analyses which rely too narrowly on linguistic representation for making sense of lived experience.

Theoretical and Social Context for the Study

Our study focuses on the experience of girls and boys as they enter the first month of their first year at primary school and examines the process by which they assume particular, highly gendered student subjectivities within the school setting. The first year of primary education in Victoria is called Prep but is variously named in other Australian states, e.g. Kindergarten in New South Wales, and Reception in South Australia. While the beginning of formal schooling has been acknowledged as a significant time of induction into the culture of formal schooling, this initiation process has traditionally been represented as gender neutral. It is our assumption, rather, that the construction of gender begins from from the very first moment children enter the institutional field of discourse and action that makes up school and schooling. Our study acknowledges the valuable and interesting work that has already been undertaken in this regard with reference to the kindergarten setting (Davies 1989, Willes, 1981, Fernie et al 1992, Corsaro, 1988), but shifts focus quite consciously away from the early childhood emphasis that has characterised much of this work to an analysis of the discursive and bodily practices that may characterise 'starting school' for some Australian children in the nineties.

The study adopts case study methodology to focus on one class group of twenty-eight Prep children entering a suburban primary school in a large regional centre in southern Victoria. The school draws on a population from a middle - lower socioeconomic area consisting of diverse multicultural origins, including Serbian, Croatian, Greek, Japanese, Sri Lankan and Chinese. The classroom and playground experience of these children was observed and recorded on videotape, audiotape and in field notes kept by the research team over the period of four and a half school weeks in January and February, 1993, that is, the first four weeks of school. Picture books, videotapes, pictures, audiotapes and worksheets presented to the children were recorded or duplicated. At least two members of the research team were present at all times during the study, and an outside, professional team of video and sound recordists were present on one full day of each week. In this way, we hoped to compile as detailed and multifaceted a representation of the practices that comprise the first month of school as possible.

In conducting this study we have a fairly clear purpose guiding our actions and interpretations. We are not neutral scientists seeking to uncover a hidden truth about what happens to little girls and boys when they go to school. We already have a well-developed lived and vicarious body of information about that. And we have already developed an often vague, muddled, and tacit set of beliefs about how we would like that to change for our daughters and sons, for our students, and for all other children within the school system. We're aiming to 'do good'

in fact, sustaining what Jane Flax (1992) calls an 'innocent hope' that we can can disrupt and displace masculinist domination and replace it with an emancipatory otherness. We are trying to figure out how to articulate and explicate these classroom practices as problematical, how to move from talking about a generalised gender project for equity, to the specification of particular practices that might hold potential for the sort of change we are envisaging.

We believe we need to speak clearly enough about these practices to begin to estrange and denature them. Our study is a first attempt at this — a pragmatic effort to watch and listen as ethnographers do: interpreting the culture being studied through what people say, how people act, and the structures they have created. And we are working from a particular theoretical standpoint that quite clearly must preclude any possibility of a disinterested interpretation. We are not wanting to find out *why* the first month of school is comprised of a particular set of social and curricular practices. We are trying to imagine how those classroom practices might be different. As Cleo Cherryholmes notes, such pragmatic research 'seeks to clarify meanings and looks to consequences. For pragmatists, values and visions of human action precede a search for descriptions, theories, explanations and narratives' (Cherryholmes 1992:13).

The values and visions which have informed our research can be described as indicative of a feminist poststructuralist position. We accept that the subject positioning of the school-girl in relation to her sense of self and others is neither a unitary nor a received identity. It is not put on with a blue-and-white-checked school uniform, or marked and measured with ticks and crosses. Rather, as Valerie Walkerdine notes, it is produced as 'a nexus of subjectivities, in relations of power which are constantly shifting' so that the school-girl is rendered 'at one moment powerful and at another powerless' (Walkerdine 1981: 14), as she works to construct her identity as one of this new social group. In poststructuralist terms the subject is *always* precarious, contradictory and 'in process'; therefore we are unable, and cannot pretend to be able to capture its essence for presentation and representation here, or anywhere.

However we take from the perspective of feminist poststructuralism the assumption and indeed the project, that school-girl subjectivities do not necessarily *have* to be, and certainly do not have to continue to be distinctively structured in the way that they currently are, even if this cannot assume universal proportions. Jane Flax reminds us that:

> If subjectivity is constituted by pregiven categories like masculine or feminine, no individual subject can escape the effects of these categories any more than s/he could speak a private language. Unless the entire discursive field (and each subject's unconscious) is changed, these categories will continue to generate particular forms of subjectivity beyond the control of individuals, no matter how freely the subject believes s/he is playing with them. (Flax 1992:455)

Bronwyn Davies calls this the 'incorrigibility' of the male-female dualism in our society (Davies, 1989). She shows how it has meant that as children we learn the discursive and

bodily practices that constitute us differentially as *either* female *or* male as we learn our language and social practice. This is because our interactions with and representations of these are based on this seemingly 'natural', but demonstrably contrived, bipolarization. The feminist work towards upsetting and challenging the male/female dualism within the existing school structures remains an important function of educational research and of our own study. We see our own project in these terms as critically pragmatic, as one of 'showing and telling' school practices in such a way as they are made 'strange' enough to warrant a questioning consideration of their 'naturalness' and 'normality', and so that they can be read as discursive constructs rather than as presentations of 'reality'.

Positioning the researcher

In taking up some of the theoretical and methodological concerns of a poststructuralist research tradition, I see the research text I am speaking as existing in complex relationships with other texts. It is important therefore, to 'call attention to the voice in which the story is being told' (Brodkey's 1987:71); that is to include information about who it is that is speaking, and about the site from which or out of which she speaks. In doing so, I resist presenting myself as a unitary subject, pretending that I have always known what I know now or that my choice of theoretic and analytic frames for the study have not themselves been the site of discursive struggle with my previous work on language and gender, which was solely framed by systemic functional linguistics.

In my dissertation work on gender and writing, reported earlier this year in *Language Arts* (Kamler 1993), I examined gender differences in the writing of a young girl and boy during their first two years of schooling. That study relied on systemic functional linguistics for both its theoretical framework and its analytic method. The analysis of the Observation genres written by the children was powerful in demonstrating how the girl and boy in the study positioned themselves differently in their reconstruction of personal experience. The analyses I conducted foregrounded the gendered nature of the writing topic choices the children made in their writing process classrooms and demonstrated that the act of text production itself was significant in constructing gendered subjectivities.

At the end of the study, however, as is often the case, I was left with more questions than answers. I could specify the differences between the boy and girl, demonstrate at the finest level of delicacy of the clause how their language choices operated to construct difference, but then what? While my analyses demonstrated that gendered meanings are often invisible and need to be read in children's written texts, they did little to help me theorise or contribute to changing the distribution of power along gender lines. It appeared, in fact, that a detailed analysis of genre focused my attention on difference rather than, for example, contradiction or multiplicity, or the myriad ways the children represented themselves outside gender

stereotypes in their writing. What became clear was that the linguistic analyses were not simply objective tools but were themselves texts, like other texts, which construct ways of seeing. It was in this context that I began to investigate language and subjectivity as these categories are developed in feminist and poststructuralist theorising.

I found, however, that while feminist poststructuralist understandings of discourse and subjectivity produced important understandings of how children may shift and take up a range of different subject positions, close analyses of specific language texts was not a part of this tradition. In fact, what has not been studied satisfactorily in a number of studies of language and gender, as Lee (1993) points out, is the relation between discourse in a poststructuralist formulation and the specificity of language choices made in particular sites, such as school. In this study we attempt to work at both levels, combining the insights of theorists such as Michel Foucault (1972) and Chris Weedon (1987), with text analytic traditions within systemic linguistics (Halliday 1985) and critical linguistic studies (Kress 1985; Fairclough 1992).

Discourse is a term used by both social theorists (e.g. Foucault 1972) and linguists (e.g. Kress 1985, Fairclough 1992). From a linguistic perspective, referring to language as discourse signals an intention to investigate it as a form of social practice. Discursive practice is manifested linguistically in the form of texts, using text in Michael Halliday's (1985) sense to include both spoken and written language use. We can analyse the features of text as traces or cues of the discourses operating, making the distinction here between text and discourse, central in Linda Brodkey's work 'We read and write (and speak) texts, not discourses - at least my understanding of poststructural theory tells me to examine texts for traces of discourse or discourses.' (Brodkey 1992:303) As texts are always enmeshed within a range of social attitudes, values and assumptions about gender relations, an analysis of texts can make visible the discourses operating and the part they play in constructing gendered subjectivities. A detailed examination of the way discursive practices operate on a moment by moment basis during the first month of school, can identify ways in which language actually functions to both privilege and marginalise a variety of gendered subject positions within the new school culture and open up the possibilities for changing them.

It has been our experience, however, that even the best linguistic analyses, grounded as they are in complex understandings of the social and political, are not sufficient for making sense of lived experience in the Prep classroom. Our early experience as observers in the new research site confronted us with what Terry Threadgold (1992:9) calls the role of embodied subjectivity in the making of all texts. Watching the new preppies begin their long engagement in the constant struggle to negotiate and hold on to interim temporary positions of power foregrounded the centrality of the body to the process of gendering. We very soon became mindful that the discourses of power which perpetuate the symbolic binaries of

gendered practice are not just to be found in language exchanges, but also in practices enacted in and through bodies. A linguistic analysis can only provide a partial text. The transcription process we developed therefore, attends carefully to both the visual and linguistic, as I show later in this paper in an analysis of a classroom body regulation event, Hands on Heads.

In sum, while my previous work has kept me committed to exploring the power of linguistic analysis, I find it is essential to situate such analyses within wider social and political concerns. Like Alison Lee (1993) in her work on gender and geography, I presently see the analytic of systemic and critical linguistics providing an important part of the method of this investigation of gendering, while feminist poststructuralist theories of the subject and of discourse supply a political context and a way to theorise about the construction of schoolgirl subjectivities and relate this to the broader socio-political context of gender/ power relations and schooling.

Texts of Body Regulation

The data I examine focuses on teacher talk, games and songs, and the way in which these regulate the schoolgirl body to achieve the work of the institution, where children will remain for half of their compulsory formal education. In making body regulation the object of study in this paper, I have examined the summary field notes for all days during the first month of school. I selected for detailed analysis transcripts from different points in time representing the beginning, middle, and end of our observations: February 3,4,16 and 26. For the purposes of this paper I closely examine data from the morning of February 3, the fifth day of school, in order to exemplify some of the patterns noted throughout the month. While a close analysis of teacher talk is significant in clarifying just what it is we currently present to young children as desirable practices in the classroom, my discourse analysis does not target for criticism the teacher.

In showing you Mrs.T's classroom, I resist producing a familiar conference genre where researchers scrutinise teacher words for their failings and use these as prescriptions for what teachers should do. Rather, I would point out that Mrs. T's position as a teacher under scrutiny was an extremely difficult one. We view her generosity in allowing us access to her classroom and herself for our research indicative of a deep personal commitment to gender equity on her part. We consider that there is little real sense in which she received any of the diverse personal and professional rewards that pertain to much classroom ethnographic or action-research work involving more interactive, collaborative participation with the researchers. Rather, she 'subjected' herself, with what we saw as a great deal of self-doubt and concern about whether or not her involvement would be of benefit to her pupils or her future pupils, and to an intensity of scrutiny that very few of 'us' writing and reading this paper will ever experience.

Mrs. T. was acutely aware, and much more than we were, that our research presence in her classroom was not necessarily either 'innocent' or 'good'. But she nonetheless permitted us a degree of free and open access to everything she did, and said within range of the radio-microphone, that now leaves her, in representation, powerless — open for intense and detailed scrutiny and interpretation. And, as we have demonstrated elsewhere (Reid, Kamler, Simpson, Maclean 1994),where we investigate the multiple and often contradictory constructions made of the classroom by our team of four classroom observers, open also perhaps to *mis*interpretation.

At the conclusion of the first day of school, Mrs. T. said of the children, 'Oh they'll shape up nicely,' signifying to herself that as a group the new Preps were mature physically, reasonably self-sufficient and able to learn the routines and procedures of schooling. The use of the material process *shape,* specifying the process as a physical rather than a mental one seems significant in signalling discourses of body regulation. In our very first observations of Mrs. T, the year before the study started, we noted striking instances of the use of regulatory language to control the student body, as field notes from that time indicate.

> I am overwhelmed and struck by the purpose of talk to regulate the child body. I always knew that children were regulated and their attention kept by rhymes and rhythms and songs but I have never seen the intense purpose being so overtly for control before. It was almost as though the purpose of the day was to ensure the obedience and that these orders were interspersed with a bit of curriculum activity here and there. The use of imperative was pervasive. The timing like clockwork. The teacher is skilled, warm, caring attentive to the children. She is master at prep speak. It is a particular kind of discourse perhaps so intensive because it is seen to be the ground that paves the way for future obedience. Focus on the physical body so prevalent. Disciplining the child body. The order and movement controlled to avoid any disruption, breaking out of the prescribed order. (Field notes: 23.10.92)

Since that time the focus on the body has been of particular interest to us. Michel Foucault's work has been particularly helpful here in offering a central emphasis on discourse as a form of power which both literally and metaphorically inscribes the collective and individual social body. We understand that discourse operates not as an abstract set of ideas but as Elizabeth Grosz (1990:63) suggests as 'a material series of processes', where power actively marks bodies as social, and inscribes them, as an effect of this, with differentiated 'attributes of subjectivity'

Part of the work of this paper is to speculate on what is involved in that shaping, and the way in which a system of bodily discipline works in the production of prep subjectivities. I use the term 'construction', here to characterise the on-going process by which the new schoolchild creates or puts together her attempts to present to herself and others a sense of a coherent subject in the face of the contradictory, oppositional and changing subjectivities that she experiences as 'self' within the practices of the classroom. In this sense I would equate the

formation of the good school-girl subject, for instance, as the formation of a *habitus* (after Bourdieu) — a set of embodied dispositions and predispositions realised in the discursive and bodily practices of being a girl in school.

> Between the child and the world, the whole group intervenes...with a whole universe of ritual practices and utterances, which people it with meanings structured in accordance with the principles of the corresponding habitus.' (Bourdieu 1990:76)

In this paper I examine some of these ritual practices of schooling to better understand their power to inscribe arbitrary principles of classroom culture in the experiences of the body.

Songs of Discipline

To investigate song as one of the ritual practices of schooling, I return to *The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow* in Text 5.1 and contextualise it in the lived experience of Mrs. T's Prep classroom. The song was sung during the first hour of school, and was one of eight songs sung during the first 40 minutes of the day, as diagrammed below in Table 5.1. The numbers indicate the passage of minutes within the first hour.

Table 5.1: February 3

Good morning. Gathering on the rug. Weather. Attendance
1.30 Ciao bon giorno
2.00 Ciao bon giorno (reprise)
3.20 How many fingers on my hand (finish 5.07)
5.49 Stand Up. Move to Circle for Morning News
6.00 I'm a little teapot
7.32 Sit Down for Morning News
12 students share news
18.10 Dingle dangle scarecrow
13 students share news
33.40 Hands on heads
34.50 Following directions at seats
39.50 Return to Rug
40.30 Incy Weency Spider
40.52 Roll Over
41.30 Twinkle Twinkle

This segment of morning activity, typical of the start of many days during the first month of school, is bounded by song. When the children first gather on the rug, Mrs. T uses three songs to gather their attention; after a long session of morning news and 'direction games' she again uses three songs to mark the end of the 40 minute segment, prior to the children moving to a new seatwork activity where they will identify their names and then trace over them.

The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow occurs in the midst of morning news and serves as an orchestrated interruption. This is the first formal news session of the year, where every child

in the circle is given the chance to speak. With 25 children present this day, it takes 26 minutes to move around to all the children. The children grow restless, their bodies squirm, they are sprawled in a variety of body positions on the rug. Mrs. T thus interrupts the news with the scarecrow song to refocus their attention.

The fact that the first 40 minutes are spent organising, regulating and arranging the children's bodies on the rug and at their seats signals something of the intensity with which the first month of school is directed at regulating and disciplining the student body before children can get to the 'real work of school.' The songs play a significant role in this disciplining. If following Frances Christie (1989) we classify songs as a curriculum genre, because they are social, members of the class interact with each other to achieve them and they are goal oriented, I would argue that childhood songs undergo a shift in their generic purpose in the Prep classroom from pleasure to regulation.

Prior to the study, when we observed seventeen of the children in October 1992 in their kindergarten classroom located across the street from the primary school, we observed that the purpose of song was pleasure. There was only one time when the whole group came together on the rug in the kindergarten and this was marked by song. The teacher began a song as the signal for the group to gather together, and the momentum and volume grew as children finished the activity they were engaged in and joined the whole group. They then sang a series of well known, and judging from the smiling and laughter, well-loved songs This was a communal time where the goals appeared to be pleasure, community, and pleasure in community.

In the Prep classroom the children also engaged in song as a community, but the purpose shifted dramatically (although the linguistic form stays the same) to collective regulation, a gathering of attention, an invitation to discontinue private conversation and move their mouths together in unison. The singing is led by the teacher who decides when and at what intervals the songs will occur and whose voice and gestures set the cadence, stress and pitch. In the Prep classroom a vehicle for pleasure is transformed into a technology of power, whereby the teacher can get the group to look at her and be subject to her disciplinary gaze.

The songs regulate by targetting the children's bodies. Most of the songs require the children to perform actions on their own bodies and to do so in unison. Hands are often the target in the forty minute segment. In *How many fingers on my hand* the children count 1,2,3,4 5 fingers first on the left hand then on the right; in *I'm a little teapot* the children form their hands into the handle and spout of the teapot; in *Twinkle twinkle little star* the children raise their hands above their hands and make their fingers into twinkling stars. In each instance, children are required to move their hands not only for the fun of the movement but to keep them off other children.

The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow song regulates larger body movements. The children are told to get in their box at the start of the song and with one minor protest which is ignored, they move down to the floor into a small ball. Only a few of the children sing with the teacher until, at the signal *Up jumped the scarecrow,* they jump up, and all join in the chorus *'I can shake my hands like this, I can shake my feet like that."'* They move down again onto the floor and repeat the cycle for the second verse, a bodily contraction, a jumping springing movement, then a shaking of the hands and feet, presumably ready to then sit down and pay attention to the twelve other children who have yet to give their morning news.

The songs are a routinized practice. Following Foucault's (1979) explanation of institutional regulation, the songs appear to operate as one of a number of systems of surveillance and regulation which are 'inscribed at the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an additional or adjacent part, but as a mechanism that is inherent to it and which increases its efficiency' (Foucault 1979:176).

The efficiency argument finds some support in the fact that Mrs. T was observed teaching the children only a few new songs during the first month of school and relied rather on songs already familiar from *Play School, Sesame Street* and kindergarten the year before. Because little energy had to be expended on remembering the words, the songs could function more directly as regulating mechanisms in the first month of school. In fact, to the dismay of one of our team who is herself a musician, Mrs. T sometimes got the words to the songs incorrect. In *The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow* for example, the rhyme was sacrificed in two lines as indicated in Table 5.2, where parentheses indicate the original words.

Table 5.2 Changes to *The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow*

When all the cows are (were) sleeping and the sun is in the sky (had gone to bed)
When all the hens are (were) roosting and the moon is in the sky (behind the cloud)

Here Mrs. T changes the verb tense from *were* to *are* and substitutes *is in the sky* for the more rhythmic *had gone to bed* and *behind the cloud* respectively. This did not seem to matter, we would argue, because the central purpose was not the rhythmic pleasure of the song, as much as the bodily discipline the song could achieve.

Body Parts

I now focus on the teacher injunctions about the body that surrounded the scarecrow song during the same first hour of school on February 3. In focusing narrowly on one morning, I seek to provide specificity to our observations; our continued presence in the classroom during the month, however, allow us to present this period of time as representative of much that occurred on other days and other hours. A common pattern that emerges here and elsewhere is that songs are most often preceded and followed by teacher talk which regulates the body and provides guidelines to students on how to produce the right body. In text 5.2, I re-present *The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow*, this time contextualised within the teacher talk surrounding it. In the transcript, the children are identified as student rather than by name when it is not possible to specify from the videotape who is actually speaking.

Text 5.2: The Dingle Dangle Scarecrow Recontextualised

1	Mrs.T	Everybody stand yourselves up for a little minute. Two feet together, shhhhh, do
2		this quietly. Nice big stretch up tall, ohh dear, Mrs T should be in bed I think
3		and down again, give your shoulders a wriggle, now your head, very slowly, oh
4		slowly, that's it just to wake us up. Right down you get in your boxes.
5	Student	What for?
6	Mrs. T	Right down.
7	Mrs.T &class	When all the cows are sleeping and the sun is in the sky, up jumped the
8		scarecrow and this is what he said. 'I'm a dingle dangle scarecrow with a
9		flippy floppy hat, I can shake my hands like this and shake my feet like that'.
10	Mrs. T	Down you go again, down you go.
11	Mrs.T &class	When all the hens are roosting and the moon is in the sky, up jumped the
12		scarecrow and shouted very loud 'I'm a dingle dangle scarecrow with a flippy
13		floppy hat, I can shake my hands like this and shake my feet like that'.
14	Mrs. T	OK guys stand up nice and tall, come on Jodie stand up, musn't talk,
15		tummies in, come on Con up you get, tummies in, two feet together,
16		shhhhhhhhh. I want your lips buttoned.
17	Student	Ohhh.
18	Mrs. T	Now sit down quietly, shh. You know I forgot something, I was going to give you
19		people something, sit sweetie sit over there. This morning I liked the way that you
20		walked in so quietly, I meant to go and give you another yellow star, so I'll give it
21		to you now and so far we've got three yellow stars on the board, maybe when we get
22		to five yellow stars there might be something special, we'll have to think about that,
23		Con could you sit up nicely please and Tom you can sit there but just sit quietly,
24		Con sit up nicely, that's it. Right now remember some of you people have
25		forgotten the rules, remember if someone is talking do you all talk at the same time?
26	Student	No, no no no.

27	Mrs. T	No, because why? Why don't you speak if someone else is speaking?
28	Student	Because.
29	Mrs. T	Because why?
30	Allan	(inaudible)
31	Mrs. T	Well that's one reason Allan, that's a good reason, does anybody else have
32		any other reasons why you might not talk, Karen, Karen I like the way
33		you're sitting up there beautifully with your hand up
34	Karen	'cause it's wrong.
35	Mrs. T	Because yes because it's a bit wrong isn't it, why is it a bit wrong do you
36		think Thomas?
37	Thomas	Because it's rude.
38	Mrs. T	It is a bit rude, I find a little bit rude, if someone speaks when I'm speaking I
39		feel maybe it's just a little bit rude.
40	Student	(inaudible) and you just can't hear what you're saying.
41	Mrs. T	That's that's right, OK so where were we up too, sitting up very nicely, we're
42		going to get to all you people in a few minutes, crossed legs.

Just prior to the song, Mrs. T gets the children to stand and stretch. The stated purpose is *just to wake us up,* (4), an innocent stretching time to move the body and help the children stay attentive to the morning news which will continue in a few moments. The lexical naming of the children's body parts, their *feet, shoulders* and *heads* 1-3), occurs both here and at the conclusion of the song, where *tummies, feet* and *lips* are named (14-16) and Mrs. T attempts to get the children focused, straightened and ready to return to the morning news.

These injunctions about the arrangement and rearrangement of student bodies, as in *tummies in, two feet together, lips buttoned* regularly punctuate the first month of Prep and are typically realised by lexically naming a variety of different body parts: including hands, lips, laps, eyes, noses, legs, arms, feet, rather than referring to the whole child body. The body parts are most often located linguistically within a teacher command, realised in the imperative mood, as is evident in the following body targetting imperatives, which come from other portions of the morning on 3 February, as represented in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Body-targeting imperatives

hands to yourself please
hands in your laps
put up your hands
crossed legs
I want to see all these legs crossed
I want your lips buttoned
listen with your ears not your mouths

look at me with your eyes so I know you are
listening to me
can I have your eyes
Ok guys close the mouths

Here posture, movement and visual gaze are all monitored and directed through teacher imperatives. Mrs. T has the power to tell the children to move their bodies in particular ways, sometimes identifying herself as the source of the command through the pronominal *I* or *me*, other times not. The class is sometimes named as *everybody*, or *guys*, but more often not named. Their body parts, however, are named in the plural, through the pronominal *your*, although this shifts sometimes to a plural body part *the mouths*, belonging to the collective. It is less easy, however, to read who the imperatives are directed at: the group or the individual? Are these the body parts belonging to one body or many? Which body is to respond? All? Some? What seems to be happening here is a discursive construction of a collective student body, for as Mary Willes (1981) points out, every year it is the job of the teacher to get children moving as one classroom body.

Individual child bodies, new to the regimes of formal schooling are thus being shaped by Mrs. T into a student body, twenty-seven individual squirming bodies are being linguistically and bodily constituted as one, to move as if with one pair of hands, one pair of legs, one mouth that can tolerate only one voice at a time, one back that is erect and attentive, nice and straight. The body parts need to be well disciplined, they do not kick, they face the front, not the back of the classroom, they raise their collective hand for permission to speak, to go to the toilet. They are quiet and speak softly, they put their hands up and they keep their hands in their own collective lap.

The construction of the collective student body, however, is not accomplished through a simple imposition of power from the teacher at the top to the children at the bottom. The teacher discourse positions the body as object, as an accumulation of named parts which needs to be surveilled. Mrs. T acts upon those objects and begins simultaneously to provide the language in which to read those actions. As Valerie Walkerdine (1987) points out, actions on objects don't make any sense without a discourse though which to read them. These ways of classifying and categorising the body, and referring to its various parts, are put to work so that 'they generate self- surveillance, wherein the subject internalises the disciplinary and cultural gaze as her or his own'(Luke 1992: 111). What is of interest here, as Allan Luke points out, is how Foucault's (1988) notion of the technologies of power, which govern the conduct of individuals, interact with technologies of self, which permit individuals to act upon themselves and their own bodies.

Teacher evaluations attached to body postures certainly seem to play a role here, as exemplified by Mrs. T's talk to the children once they are seated again following the scarecrow song (19-22). Here Mrs. T praises the group for walking. Her use of the pronominal *you* suggests the walking was accomplished as one body which will now be rewarded. The action of walking is itself not an action worthy of praise, but when done quietly and collectively is read by Mrs. T as worthy of yellow stars. Later in the year, presumably, stars will be awarded for academic work, but here in the first month of school the serious work is constituted as body regulation. There is an interesting shift here as well from the pronominal *I* to *we*, which works to discursively position the children as colluding in Mrs T's evaluations. She is clearly the dispenser of stars and praise, *I was going to give , I liked the way, I meant to go, I'll give,* but when it comes to stars, it is *we* who are *getting* them and *thinking* about an extra special reward. This linguistic slippage between student and teacher subjectivity works to help students engage in self-surveillance.

While much of the Mrs. T's evaluations are directed at the collective student body, individuals are also singled out and named either for transgressing or for complying. It is through these naming practices (23-25) that some of the more overt gendering work is accomplished. Con and Tom are named as boys who have transgressed, who have not internalised the attributes of nicely and quietly. Although linguistically the teacher evaluations are not realised as negative evaluations, but as an interrogative (*could you sit up nicely?*) and an imperative (*sit up nicely*), they position the boys negatively as having bodies which are hard to control. In Luke's words,

> Those who have not internalised the teacher;'s gaze, those who are not willing participants are singled out... Where the technology of the self fails the technology of power steps in. Where the gaze has not been internalised by the children, it is externally asserted by the teacher. (Luke 1992:120)

The pattern of externally asserting the gaze, however, is clearly gendered and girls are more often named for being willing subjects, for bodily obedience and compliance, as in *Karen I like the way you're sitting up there beautifully with your hand up* (32-33). While boys are seen for *not sitting*, girls are seen for *sitting*. This does not mean that there are not also girls transgressing or boys complying. It does mean that such actions are often not seen/read/spoken or named in the teacher discourse. Michelle, for example, a girl who is constituted through the teacher discourse as a good schoolgirl subject, engages in a great deal of aggressive body action, kicking Tom, hitting Con on the head when he is lying down. She is never singled out or named, however, for such transgressions. It is not clear whether Mrs. T even sees her engaging in such acts, because the teacher gaze itself is constituted within the male female dualisms and what is seen and named is always partial, meaning both incomplete and interested.

To illustrate further how it is that bodily practices such as sitting become tied to pupil selection in gendered ways, I examine an interactive sequence during a story reading event later in the morning of 3 February, presented below as text 5.3. Mrs. T has set up a book on the easel and is looking for someone to help her with the class story, to move the pointer on the words as they are read aloud by her and the class.

Text 5.3 Perfect sitting

1	Mrs. T	I'm looking for someone to help me, wonder who's sitting up very
2		nice...Right now Ellen have you been sitting like that all that time? How did
3		you get to be so perfect? Have you been practising for years? You haven't it
4		just comes natural to you? Come up here and be my helper, anybody who
5		sits up like that guys has just got to help me.
		As the lesson proceeds Rohan is named for not listening
6	Mrs. T	I'm sorry but we have to read it again. Rohan turn around let's read it again
7		because Rohan missed out on the story. 'Look I'm at school.'
		Minutes later, however, Mrs. T chooses Rohan as a participant in the reading, ostensibly again on the basis of his body posture.
8	Mrs. T	Now let's have a little look here, I wonder if I can ask somebody and I'm only
9		going to ask those people who are sitting beautifully and I think perhaps, oh
10		gee tricky tricky tricky, Rohan you're sitting up pretty nice now actually,
11		how about coming up and seeing if you can find me the word that might say
12		sssschoool. I wonder if he's clever Ellen do you think so?

Here posture is overtly used as the criteria for choosing. Ellen is singled out from the collective body and praised for her sitting (2-5). She is positioned by the teacher discourse within the male female binaries. Sitting nicely is equated with being perfect (2), and this comes naturally to Ellen (3), ostensibly because she is a girl. She is defined as natural within the preconstructed binaries and is marked as working within the feminine. Anyone who sits like girls gets to help the teacher (4-5). The good schoolgirl subjectivity thus becomes an extension of the female teacher subjectivity and gaze. Ellen is chosen to stand near the teacher, to hold the pointer of the teacher and face the children. She is awarded by being allowed to take on the gaze directly as teacher.

Her performance stands in direct contrast to Rohan who is clearly not perfect. He is *pretty nice* (10). He/his body still needs to be disciplined, the teacher gaze must stay firmly on him. Ellen the perfect sitter is asked to take on teacher subjectivity and maintain that gaze externally.

Perfect sitting becomes invested with moral regulation and Ellen is invited to take on the teacher judgment and decide if Rohan is clever or not, *I wonder if he's clever Ellen do you think so?* (11-12) This type of gender regulation through posture, repeated hundreds of times during the first month in incidental, invisible ways has real effects not only on children's bodies, but on their thoughts and ways of being. As Bourdieu (1990:73) puts it, 'What is 'learned by the body' is not something that one has, like knowledge that can be brandished, but something that one is.'

Hands on Heads

It is dangerous to focus solely on teacher talk and select data to demonstrate how technologies of power play a part in the representation and reproduction of gendered subjectivities; dangerous because it constructs an overly neat and simple picture. It is not the case that teachers impose discipline and children simply comply; disciplinary power is not unitary any more than the subjectivities of the children who are in the process of becoming schoolgirls and schoolboys are unitary. Further, it is important to remember that transcripts of classroom events are themselves only a construction and a partial one at that. The transcripts in texts 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 have been 'found' and presented here as representative of the classroom action we observed. They are too incomplete a model to allow us to make any truth claims or pronouncements about what teachers should do. The ways in which I have presented transcripts thus far in this paper, in fact, privilege the linguistic over the visual representation. Although I have been discussing the student body and the ways in which it is regulated through teacher discourse, the transcripts have paid attention to words at the expense of the body and this omission constructs new fictions.

To counter this, I examine one final instance of body regulation discourse from a session of Hands on Heads, which occurred towards the end of the first forty minutes on the morning of February 3. In Text 5.4 I attempt to make more complex the analysis presented thus far by writing the body into the transcript. The procedure is to put the teacher imperatives in this facsimilie of Simon Says in the left column and the corresponding actions of two children, Jodie and Tom, in the right column. This itself is a selection. Twenty five children participated in this 'game' yet I focus on the way two children responded to and resisted it, not only because I found their interaction fascinating, but because this was where the video camera was focused, another selection. In representing Text 5.4, the numbers in the left column divide the teacher talk into lines rather than turns, as has occurred elsewhere in this paper As the teacher is the only speaker, the left column constitutes one turn. The children's turns, by contrast, occur in the nonverbal domain and are represented in the right column. These are not, however, numbered separately, but rather aligned with the teacher talk to highlight the relationship between what the teacher says and what some of the children actually do.

Text 5.4 Hands on heads

1	Mrs. T	Could we please have Amy, Nikola.	Jodie crosses circle to move beside Tom.
2		Could you just stick Amy over there for	Jodie pushes Tom away.
3		me please. That's it and then she	Tom pushes Jodie again.
4		can keep an eye on what we're doing.	Jodie moves to push Tom.
5		Stand tall Jodie.	Jodie moves away from Tom back across the circle where she began.
6		Hands on heads, hands on shoulders,	Jodie returns to Tom, hands out, tongue out.
7		hands ohh, hands behind backs, hands on	
8		knees, gee some of you are very quick, but	
9		I'm quicker I'll trick you, hands on feet	Tom pushes Jodie.
10		Hands on elbows	Tom pushes Ayse who returns from toilet.
11		Are you right there Ayse? shouldn't be with	Mrs. T pulls Ayse closer to her.
12		Hands on nose	Tom squeezes the back of Jodie's neck.
13		Hands on lips	Tom pushes Jodie's back.
14		Hands on eyes, hands on ears	Tom stamps his foot.
15		Hands on heads, tricky one	Jodie points to Tom's foot.
16		Hands behind head	Tom puts his foot on Jodie's foot.
17		mmm, very good, I didn't trick anybody	Tom taps his foot on Jodie's, then exerts pressure. She opens her mouth as if to yell.
18		Hands on feet Tom	
19		Hands on feet, hands on knees	Jodie and Tom both bend down to touch feet.
20		Hands behind backs	Tom pokes his finger into Jodie's shoulder.
21		Hands in front	Jodie and Tom stare at one another, she stands up, he remains crouched.
22		Hands on shoulders, hands on hips, where's	
23		your hips? hands on hips	
24		Hands on shoulders	Tom pulls Jodie's shorts.
25		Hands on elbows, stand nice and tall, arms	Tom pulls Jodie's shorts again.
26		by your side	
27		Do you know what I think Tom.	Tom stands up. Jodie watches.
28		Sshh, shh, shh	Jodie points across the circle.

29	Do you know what I really think, I think	Tom moves across the circle away from Jodie
30	there are some people in here who really	to stand beside Benjamin and the boys.
31	need some practice in listening, because	
32	when I say something they don't always	
33	hear what I'm saying. So listen very	
34	carefully, I hope I'm not going to muck	
35	things up here, I want you to go and stand	
36	behind a chair, off you go.	

Although Mrs. T represents Hands on Head as a game (8-9), like the songs, this is a childhood game being transformed into a technology of regulation, which Mrs. T will be able to call on during the course of the day, the month, the year to regulate the children's behaviour.

Linguistically, the imperative *hands on heads* has been shortened or ellipsed from *put your hands on your heads* where the actual command put is omitted, the *hands* are thematised or come first and the pronominal *your* is omitted so that the individual *heads* of the children become a singular collective target, *head*. The effect of this is to shift the focus to the children's hands and away from both the instruction itself, *put*, and the one who is telling the children to move their bodies in prescribed ways, Mrs. T. We can diagram this linguistic transformation as follows in Table 5.4

Table 5.4 Linguistic transformation

Mrs T says put your hands on your heads	becomes
Put your hands on head	becomes
Hands on Head	

Linguistically, then, the children ostensibly have agency, or rather their hands do, to act upon their own bodies, another instance of how technologies of power interact with technologies of self to produce self-surveillance. Writing in the actions of Jodie and Tom alongside the teacher imperatives in Text 5.4, however, reveals that such body disciplining is not simply taken up by the children and internalised. The linguistic/visual representation of Hands on Heads, in fact, allows us to produce different and more complex readings of this 'game', whereby Hands on Heads becomes transformed into Hands on Jodie.

Walkerdine (1981) notes that gendered relations of power and resistance are continually reproduced in the classroom, in continual struggle and constantly shifting. Here alongside the authorised teacher discourse, we see Tom producing actions with his hands, as he is being commanded, but resistantly. Powerless within the domain of the teacher discourse, he positions Jodie and Ayse as powerless subjects of other discourses of masculinist violence.

He shoves Ayse as she returns to the circle (10) and targets a number of Jodie's body parts including her neck (12), her back (13), her foot (16-17), her shoulder (20) and even the more taboo area covered by her shorts (24-25). Although Tom is not a physically grown man, he can take the position of men through his actions on girls' bodies. His power is gained by refusing to be constituted as the powerless subject in the teacher discourse and recasting the girls as the powerless subject of his.

It is not the case, however, that Jodie simply accepts this positioning. She is the one, after all, who moves towards Tom in the first place. Although she returns momentarily to her initial place in the circle after being named by Mrs. T (5), she returns buoyantly, hands on hips, tongue out, almost daring Tom. Significantly, Tom is positioned in the circle beside Bianca and Alice, two of the girls Jodie likes to spend time with. She may in fact move in order to sit near her friends and displace Tom to make a space for herself. Although she endures physical abuse from Tom, she remains an active participant and in the end Tom does leaves the space. Jodie points in the direction of the boys (28) and Tom moves back across the circle to stand with Benjamin and the others (29-30).

An important effect of this power struggle is the way in which Mrs T interprets Tom's actions to lessen their oppressive effect. It is not clear, in fact what she sees, as her attention is also directed at the twenty-three other children present on this day. The first time she polices the disturbance, she names Jodie as the perpetrator, *Stand tall Jodie* (6), although Tom has been central to the pushing. When Tom shoves Ayse with some force, it is Ayse, the victim who is named,You right Ayse? (11) rather than Tom, the perpetrator of the violence. When Tom is finally named (18), after he more obviously stamps his foot on Jodie's, the reprimand is realised linguistically through the imperative of the game *Hands on feet Tom.* Tom's resistance is thus seamlessly incorporated back into the domain of the teacher discourse where he is less powerful. He is not reprimanded for what he has done and his violence remains unnamed, just a normal part of classroom life.

At the conclusion Tom is again named *Do you know what I think Tom* (27), but it is unclear whether Mrs.T is dissatisfied primarily with his performance or the whole group's, as her discourse (29-33) targets *some people* and *they* as the offenders, as the ones who don't listen, who *don't always hear what I'm saying* (32-33).As a consequence, Mrs. T initiates a further session of body regulation (33-36), where the children will be directed to stand behind, in front of, on and under the chairs, taking steps forward and backward to see if this time they can listen more carefully and get their bodies disciplined.

Constructing the transcript with the teacher imperatives on the left and the child actions on the right, highlights the fact that in this interaction it is Mrs. T who controls the verbal domain. She talks, she speaks into existence a regime of regulation. The children do not speak, but to

the extent that they mobilise resistance this occurs in the nonverbal domain, through the body. Thus it is that both the regulating and the resisting occurs through bodily practices. This is not to say that the teacher's words do not have real effect. They target and surveil the body, limiting the range of subject positions made available to children. Subjectivity however, as Walkerdine (1987: 10) points out, is 'not simply produced within single texts, but at the intersection of competing discourses and practices.'

Thus we see in this session of Hands on Heads that the actions of Jodie and Tom put into play counter discourses which break the surface of this regulation. Teacher discourse is a form of power which inscribes the collective student body, but the process of inscription is itself a struggle. While Mrs. T's discourse positions the children's bodies as object, the discourses of masculinity mobilised by Tom's actions target Jodie's body as object and the discourses of femininity and female bonding mobilised by Jodie's actions compete with Tom's for supremacy. Without the visual representation of Jodie and Tom's actions, it would be possible to read these children, and the 23 others not discussed, as simply submitting to school imposed disciplinary power. Such an analysis demonstrates, therefore, the importance of reading the embodied text rather than the linguistic text alone and of utilising more complex frames for reading children's actions than are currently available to teachers in many classrooms.

This analysis has attempted to make visible some of the seamless ways in which everyday school practices operate to discipline the student body. In his conceptualisation of 'kindergarten as academic bootcamp', Harry Gracey (1962) notes that learning to live by the routines of school appears to be the principal content of the student role. Such notions are confirmed by this analysis of the set of ritualised songs, games and routines put in place in Mrs. T's classroom during the first month of school.

While it was clearly Mrs. T's purpose to teach the children systems of rules and control, however, it was not her intention to construct gendered subjectivities through such practices. Mrs. T is a teacher whose discourse is remarkably free of gender positioning. In certain situations,however, Mrs. T is herself positioned within highly gendered discourses and she often acts unwittingly and against her own stated intentions, to reproduce both the discourse and its effects within her own social space. This raises serious problems about disciplining children's bodies. While it is commonly accepted that children need to be regulated in some manner if they are going to be schooled, how this is done is at issue. The fact that the process of regulation appears to be so deeply and yet invisibly gendered needs serious consideration by the teaching and research communities. This paper takes one important step in the process by attempting to describe and name these practices so that we may begin collectively to envisage others.

References

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. (trans. Richard Nice). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brodkey, Linda (1987). Writing critical ethnographic narratives. *Anthropology and Education* 18:2, 67-76.

Brodkey, Linda (1992). Articulating poststructural theory in research on literacy. In R. Beach, J.L. Green, M.L. Kamil & T. Shanahan (eds) *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research.* Urbana, ILL: NCRE & NCTE, 293-318.

Cherryholmes, Cleo H. (1992) Notes on pragmatism and scientific realism. *Educational Researcher*, 21 (6) August-September, 13-17.

Christie, Frances (1989). *Curriculum genres in early childhood education: A case study in writing development.* A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Sydney: Department of Linguistics.

Corsaro, William (1988). Peer culture in the preschool. *Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27 (1), 19-24.

Davies, Bronwyn (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Flax, Jane (1992). The end of innocence. In Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (eds), *Feminists Theorize the Political.* New York and London: Routledge, 445-463.

Fernie, David, Davies, Bronwyn, Kantor, Rebecca, and McMurray, Paula (1992). *Becoming a person in the preschool: Creating integrated gender, school culture and peer culture positionings.* Unpublished manuscript in preparation, Ohio University.

Foucault, Michel (1977). *Language, counter-memory, practice.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Foucault, Michel (1979). *Discipline and Punish.* New York: Harper.

Gracey, Harry (1962). Learning the student role: Kindergarten as academic boot camp. In H.R. Stub (ed) *The sociology of education: A source book, 3rd ed.* Ill: Dorsey Press.

Grosz, Elizabeth (1990). Inscriptions and body-maps: Representations and the corporeal. In Terry Threadgold and Anne Cranny-Francis (eds) *Feminine, masuculine and representation.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 62-74.

Halliday, M.A.K.(1985). *Introduction to functional grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

Kamler, Barbara (1993). Constructing gender in the process writing classroom. *Language Arts,* 70 (2), 20-28.

Kamler, Barbara, Maclean, Rod, Reid, Joanne and Simpson,Alyson, (1994). *Shaping up nicely: The formation of schoolgirls and schoolboys in the first month of school.* Report for Gender Equity Curriculum Reform Project, Department of Education, Employment and Training, Canberra, ACT.

Kress, Gunther (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice.* Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.

Lee, Alison (1993). *Gender and geography: Literacy pedagogy and curriculum.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Murdoch University.

Luke, Allan (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early literacy training. *Linguistics and Education,* 4, 107-129.

Reid, Joanne, Kamler, Barbara, Simpson, Alyson, Maclean, Rod (1994, in press). 'Do you see what I see': Reading a different classroom scene. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*..

Threadgold, Terry (1992). *Performing genre: Violence, the making of protected subjects, and the discourses of critical literacy and radical pedagogy*. Plenary paper International Domains of Literacy Conference, London Institute of Education, London University, September 1992.

Walkerdine, Valerie (1987). Surveillance, subjectivity and struggle: Lessons from pedagogic and domestic practices. *CHS Occasional papers No. 11*, University of Minnesota.

Walkerdine, Valerie (1981). Sex, power and pedagogy. *Screen Education* 38, Spring, 14-24.

Willes, Mary (1981). Children becoming pupils: A study of discourse in nursery and reception classes. In Clem Adelman (ed), *Uttering muttering: Collecting, using and reporting talk for social and educational research*, London, Grant McIntyre, 51-68.

Weedon, Chris (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.